

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

CHARLES RAY BELL, JR.,

Plaintiff,

VS.

PHILLIP N. SMITH, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:14-cv-1730-GMN-PAL

## ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen, (ECF No. 4), which states that this case should be dismissed.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a de novo determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna–Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed.

Accordingly,


**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 4), is

1 **ADOPTED** in full.

2 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

3 The Clerk is instructed to enter judgment accordingly and close the case.

4  
5 **DATED** this <sup>23</sup> day of November, 2015.

6  
7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
10 United States District Court  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25